

**State Committee of Interpreters
Division of Professional Registration
3605 Missouri Blvd
Jefferson City, Missouri**

September 26, 2001 -- Open Minutes

The open session of the State Committee of Interpreters was called to order by Loretto Durham, Chair, at 9:45 am on September 26, 2001 at the Division of Professional Registration, 3605 Missouri Blvd, Jefferson City, Missouri.

Members Present:

Loretto Durham
Carrie McCray
Sandy Drummond
Kim McEnulty

Staff Present:

Pam Goose, Executive Director
Roxy Brockman, Clerk IV
Tammy Mouden, Licensure Technician II
Alaina Vega, Assistant Attorney General

Public Present:

Amy Fowler, Missouri Commission for the Deaf
Roger Brown, Missouri Commission for the Deaf
Dr. Roy Miller, Missouri Commission for the Deaf
Judy Benfield, LEAD Institute
Janice Cobb, LEAD Institute

Review and Approval of Agenda

Ms. Durham indicated that Item #2 needed to be removed from the agenda and Ms. Drummond said she would like to further outline three rules in addition to the draft letter that is included in Item #10, those three items are: mentorship, intern practicum permit and temporary licenses. A motion was made by Ms. McCray and seconded by Ms. Drummond to approve the agenda as amended. All approved.

Review and Approval of Minutes

A motion was made by Ms. Drummond and seconded by Ms. McCray to approve the minutes from the open session of the July 24, 2001 meeting with corrections. All approved.

Report from Executive Director

MCD Convention, October 19-21, 2001 – Ms. Goose reported that the exhibitor table fee has been requested. She indicated she would follow-up to determine if MCD has received the fee and if an exhibit table will be reserved for the Committee's use. Ms. Drummond, Ms. McEnulty, and Ms. Durham will be attending. The MCD convention schedule was discussed and that there would be a co-presentation by the MCD and State Committee of Interpreters from 10:30am to 11:30am on Saturday morning. The exhibit table can be set up between 2:00pm and 5:00pm on Friday. Ms. Drummond and Ms. Durham will be at the exhibit table between 9:00pm – 11:00pm on Friday, Ms. Durham and Ms. McEnulty will be at the exhibit table between 11:30am – 1:00pm on Saturday and Ms. Durham and Ms. McEnulty will take turns covering the exhibit table between 5:30pm – 8:00pm on Saturday evening. Rules and Regulations,

Application packet materials, Newsletters and Division Brochures will be prepared for the Committee's use at the exhibit table. The Committee requested that staff make name tags for each of them and create a sign indicating when they would be available at the exhibit table and that if they are not available they can be located in the immediate area wearing a name tag like the sample attached. Ms. Drummond indicated she would call Ms. Goose the Monday before the convention and they will work out details in regard to getting the display booth materials to the Lake of the Ozarks. There will be a BCI meeting on October 19, 2001, Friday, and that will determine the content for the one-hour co-presentation given by the MCD and State Committee of Interpreters at the Convention. Ms. Drummond said she felt that the State Committee of Interpreters should talk about licensure, renewals and temporary permits during the co-presentation. The Committee requested a large version of the MCD and State Committee of Interpreters flow chart be created.

Renewals: Ms. Goose reported that renewals will be mailed approximately 6 weeks earlier this year and that this may cause MCD to receive calls in regard to certification as the interpreters will have to attest to having current certification and being in compliance with MCD's certification requirements. Ms. Goose indicated that the State Committee of Interpreters can pursue discipline of a license if someone does not maintain current certification.

Vacant Member Positions – Ms. Goose said that all of the vacant member positions are being worked on and that she has been asked to verify several names but did not know where this was in the process. Since we do not have deaf representation, it was suggested that Ms. McCray post the vacant member information on the MO Deaf List serve.

Temporary Licenses — Ms. Goose said the process for temporary licenses is very clear but a list of accepted certifications needs to be created based upon input from the Missouri Commission for the Deaf and the State Committee of Interpreters. Ms. Goose reviewed the statute with the Committee in regard to temporary licensure and it is issued for only 90 days. The Committee questioned the process if a complaint is filed against a temporary license holder. Ms. Goose responded that the complaint process would remain the same and depending on when the information is received will determine if the Committee pursues making the temporary license invalid or using the information in making future temporary license or licensure decisions.

A motion was made by Ms. Drummond and seconded by Ms. McCray to accept the list of approved certifications from the BCI when it is provided to us in writing, that Ms. Goose be given the authority to make all decisions in regard to granting temporary licenses. All approved.

Ms. Drummond wanted to discuss a previous request of Dr. Miller's in regard to the Committee considering issuing temporary licenses to those applicants waiting for their certification results. Ms. Goose indicated that currently the state committee could not issue temporary licenses under those circumstances as temporary licenses have already been defined by statute. Ms. Drummond said that an option would be for the Committee to consider and discuss the possibility of opening up the statute to also allow temporary licenses to be issued to those people awaiting their certification results. The Missouri Commission for the Deaf has had a back log of 8-9 months to get certification results out to applicants. Ms. Fowler reported that due to extra hours put in by office staff and evaluators they are approximately 2 ½ months behind. Ms. Fowler said that is within the 90 day time limit they have tried to strive for from the beginning. The Committee discussed this issue and it was decided that there was no longer a need to open up the statute in order to accommodate MCD's request since the MCD has greatly reduced their backlog.

Ms. Goose reported to the Committee members that Ms. Fowler had contacted our office and was requesting to include an application packet at the time they send out the certifications. Ms.

Groose suggested that the Missouri Commission for the Deaf send the office a list with names and addresses of applicants when they take their certification examination and we will send out the application packet since our information can change frequently.

Meetings

-- Attended

- MCD/BCI – no meetings to report on.

-- Upcoming

- State Committee of Interpreters – next meeting is a conference call scheduled for Friday, November 30, 2001 from 1:00pm –4:00pm
- BCI – Friday, September 28, 2001 will be attended by Ms. Drummond, Ms. McCray and Ms. Groose.
- BCI – Friday, October 19, 2001 at Tan Tar A, Osage Beach, Missouri, from 9:00am – 4:00pm. This is a tentatively scheduled meeting.

Statutes:

209.321.6 – Ms. Vega discussed the language that Ms. Rector has proposed to be added to the exemption language to allow someone to interpret for convention, conference, meeting or professional groups for a seven day period during a calendar year. The people that fall into this category would not have to apply for a temporary license. The Committee members questioned the phrase “is not considered to be interpreting.” Ms. Vega said that this language is the way a lot of statutes are worded to show this is an exempt status. The Committee discussed various scenarios that may involve interpreting and how this language may impact interpreting in Missouri. The Committee said that if they decided to pursue the addition to the exempted language that they may want to consider removing the phrase “licensed by another state” and restrict the types of certifications that would be accepted. This needs to be discussed at the next meeting and Ms. Durham recommended that each committee member create a list of certifications that they would feel comfortable exempting and what situations they would be exempt for that seven day period, as well as if the Committee wants those people to notify the office when they are in the state.

209.323.2 -- The Committee reviewed proposed statute language changes prepared by Ms. Rector in regard to renewal and reinstatement of interpreter licenses. This language clarifies current certification requirements that must be met at each renewal and reinstatement. The committee indicated they would like to see the language written in such a way that we do not have to indicate the number of hours of CEU required by MCD but refer back to the MCD's statute number that will indicate the total number of CEUs required. Dr. Miller recommended that the word “lapsed” be included in this proposed language as they have the ability to not renew a certification if someone does not complete their CEUs. He recommended that the attorney for the State Committee of Interpreters and the attorney for the Missouri Commission for the Deaf talk together to work out the language.

POLICIES

Sunshine Law – Ms. Groose said the attorney for the Department of Economic Development has requested that all committees, commissions and boards accept a Sunshine Law Policy. A motion was made by Ms. Drummond and seconded by Ms. McEnulty to accept the Sunshine Law Policy Statement. All approved.

Guidelines for Application Approval – Ms. Groose said this policy was created based upon the decision of the Committee at their last meeting to grant her authority to approve applicants for

licensure. A motion was made by Ms. Drummond and seconded by Ms. McEnulty to accept the Guidelines for Approving Applications. All approved.

PROPOSED RULES

The Committee reviewed the letter Ms. Drummond drafted in response to the proposed rules by the Missouri Commission of the Deaf. In response to the draft letter, Dr. Miller indicated he would be happy to support the development of a strategic plan for the training and education of interpreters in Missouri. However, he said this does not impact upon the rules themselves and he would not be responding to this portion of the letter when responding to letters and comments about the proposed rule changes. He said he was happy to support the accreditation of interpreter education programs in Missouri, but asked Ms. Drummond to clarify what they were to implement if a university expressed an interest in this type of program. Ms. Drummond responded that she did not know all the options available but the Conference of Interpreter Trainers (CIT) has developed an accreditation process for interpreter training programs called a self study review. She said there was a significant fee involved with doing the self-study review and it is not a requirement in the state of Missouri. She said if there was some incentive to the interpreter training programs (ITPs) in Missouri to do the self-study review and thought if there was some requirement to do the self study review, but was not aware if it could be made to be a requirement. She said she thought there should be some kind of investigation into the self study review by CIT or some other accreditation process and develop some way to either encourage or require interpreter education programs in Missouri to comply with accreditation that is specific to ITPs. Dr. Miller said he would be happy to work with anybody who has the time and interest in developing guidelines or procedures that can be suggested to colleges and universities. He said the big problem in trying to develop more ITPs is money. He said ITPs were originally developed using money from the RSA, that is still a principal funding source but the idea of a new ITP starting and receiving money from the federal government is a very small possibility now. He said alternatives needed to be looked at i.e., distance learning programs. He said that is the direction the federal money is moving now. He said the federal government would not want William Woods to set up a program with 10 students, they want the University of Colorado to set up a distance learning program that they can beam to every state in the union or any place that can receive and download telecast. He sees money as the real problem that is holding up universities. He said he was happy to work with any one but again he did not see this issue as impacting the rule or the rule language, and would not be responding to it when he responds to comments and letters about the proposed rules as he did not think it applies.

In regard to the supplemental evaluation, he said he felt this would engender some dialog and would be happy to see that. He said he can personally accept deleting this proposed rule with no problem. He said the reason the proposed rule was developed was to avoid the use of the grievance process for silly things, that they wanted to reserve the grievance process for serious grievances.

In regard to the Intern/Practicum Certification, Ms. Drummond indicated to Dr. Miller that the State Committee has expressed support of this concept during past meetings and this is something the committee needed to discuss during the current meeting and had not had the opportunity to do so yet. She said the committee needs to discuss this and determine how it will impact licensure and if there is any need to file new rules. Dr. Miller said he wanted to share his perspective of what the discussion should entail and it's end result. He said he felt the end result was that the committee had no legal responsibility to license intern/practicum students. He said he felt the internship/practicum issue was like other professions that have internship/practicums, the interns do not get a license but can freely perform their duties under direct supervision.

At this time Dr. Miller, Ms. Fowler and Mr. Brown left the meeting. The committee discussed each of the proposed rules and continued to discuss and revise the draft letter to be sent to the

MCD in response to their proposed rules. Ms. Drummond will revise the letter as discussed and send it to Ms. Goose to be submitted to the Missouri Commission for the Deaf by October 4, 2001 which is the last day of the 30 day comment period.

The Committee requested that an item about student licenses or exempting them during practicum/internship be placed on the next agenda.

A motion was made by Ms. McCray and seconded by Ms. Drummond to close at 4:50 pm for the purpose of discussing #1, #2, #3, #9. Ms. Drummond, Ms. Durham, Ms. McEnulty and Ms. McCray all approved.

A motion was made by Ms. Drummond and seconded by Ms. McCray to return to open session at 5:15 pm. Ms. Drummond, Ms. Durham, Ms. McEnulty and Ms. McCray all approved.

The next meeting of the State Committee of Interpreters will be October 2, 2001 from 3:00pm – 5:00pm via conference call for the purpose of discussing closed items only.

The meeting adjourned at 5:15pm

Pamela Goose, Executive Director

Date Approved by the Board